



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,712	01/08/2002	Robert G. Tryon III	10652-005-999	6460
24341	7590	10/06/2003	EXAMINER	
Pennie & Edmonds, LLP 3300 Hillview Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94304				BARAN, MARY C
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/043,712	TRYON ET AL.	
	Examiner Mary Kate B Baran	Art Unit 2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2,6</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 2 B, block 100, "frquency" should be – frequency – . A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- (a) On page 4 line 1, "instruction" should be – instructions –.
- (b) On page 5 line 24, "System 22 is this" should be – System 22 in this –.
- (c) On page 8 line 1, "can have disjoint" should be – can have a disjoint –.
- (d) On page 11 lines 22-23, "warning included" should be – warning is included –.
- (e) On page 13 line 8 "cell phone systems) 23 to" should be – cell phone systems) to –.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 25 line 23 "criteria. ." should be – criteria. –. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 12-14, 17, 25-34, 44, 48-51, 55, 56, 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) (hereinafter Quist).

Referring to claims 1, 25 and 48, Quist teaches a computer implemented method, apparatus, and a computer program product for use in conjunction with a computer system for predicting failure in a system (see Quist, column 4 lines 41-55), comprising: sensors for acquiring data from a system (see Quist, column 3 lines 27-33); a first computer comprising: a processor (see Quist, column 5 lines 19-22); a memory containing: instructions for measuring said data (see Quist, column 4 lines 12-21); instructions for creating a prediction of a failure of said system using a probabilistic model and said data (see Quist, column 3 lines 49-56); and instructions for communicating said prediction (see Quist, column 3 lines 57-61); and a communication device for communicating said prediction (see Quist, column 3 lines 57-61).

Referring to claims 2, 27 and 49, Quist teaches that said measuring further comprises receiving system information from said system (see Quist, column 4 lines 17-21).

Referring to claims 3 and 50, Quist teaches that said creating further comprises creating a prediction of a failure of a component of said system (see Quist, column 5 lines 7-10 and column 8 lines 32-36).

Referring to claims 4, 44 and 51, Quist teaches that said creating further comprises creating a prediction of a failure of multiple systems based on said prediction (see Quist, column 6 lines 7-20).

Referring to claim 5, Quist teaches that said measuring (see Quist, column 4 lines 12-21), creating (see Quist, column 3 lines 49-56), and communicating (see Quist, column 3 lines 57-61) steps are performed on said system (see Quist, column 3 lines 16-22).

Referring to claims 6, 33 and 55, Quist teaches comparing said prediction to criteria (see Quist, column 6 lines 7-16).

Referring to claim 7, Quist teaches that at least one of said creating and communicating steps occurs at a remote location (see Quist, column 3 lines 49-61 and Figure 1).

Referring to claims 8, 34 and 56, Quist teaches that said probabilistic model comprises multiple models (see Quist, column 5 lines 36-45).

Referring to claim 12, Quist teaches sending said data to a remote location and wherein said creating occurs at said remote location (see Quist, column 5 lines 36-45).

Referring to claim 13, Quist teaches receiving said prediction from said remote location (see Quist column 5 lines 46-50).

Referring to claim 14, Quist teaches developing said probabilistic model prior to said creating (see Quist, column 3 lines 49-56).

Referring to claim 17, Quist teaches that said developing further comprises setting criteria for communicating said prediction (see Quist column 3 lines 49-65).

Referring to claim 26, Quist teaches that said instructions for creating further comprise instructions for predicting failure of at least one component of said system (see Quist, column 5 line 67 – column 6 line 6).

Referring to claims 28 and 66, Quist teaches a second computer program product comprising a second computer readable storage medium and a second computer program mechanism embedded therein (Quist et al., Figure 1) containing: instructions for measuring said data (Quist et al., column 5 lines 23-28); instructions for storing said data (Quist et al., column 28-35); and instructions for sending said data to said first computer as said system information (Quist et al., column 5 lines 46-50).

Referring to claims 29 and 67, Quist teaches a second computer program product comprising a second computer readable storage medium and a second computer program mechanism embedded therein (Quist et al., Figure 1) containing: instructions for receiving said prediction (Quist et al., column 5 lines 23-28); and instructions for communicating said prediction (Quist et al., column 5 lines 46-50).

Referring to claim 30, Quist teaches that said communication device further comprises a warning signal (see Quist, column 5 lines 10-15).

Referring to claim 31, Quist teaches that said apparatus further comprising a sending device for sending said data to a remote location (see Quist, column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 11).

Referring to claim 32, Quist teaches that said first computer is located at said remote location (see Quist, column 4 lines 12-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 15, 24, 35, 45, 47, 52, 54 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) in view of Gollomp (U.S. Patent No. 4,766,595).

Referring to claims 9, 35 and 57, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except for ranking variables in said probabilistic model according to said variable's contribution to said prediction.

Gollomp teaches ranking variables in said probabilistic model according to said variable's contribution to said prediction (see Gollomp, column 5 lines 3-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Gollomp because ranking the variables would have allowed the skilled artisan to determine which failures are more important (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 61-64).

Referring to claim 15, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except for identifying at least one failure mechanism of a component of said system from said component's characteristics selected from a group comprising: material properties, environmental conditions, design characteristics, component loading, and

component usage; identifying significant random variables of said at least one failure mechanism; identifying statistical parameters of said significant random variables; and formulating a strategy for probabilistic analysis.

Gollomp teaches identifying at least one failure mechanism of a component of said system from said component's characteristics selected from a group comprising: material properties (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 28-34), environmental conditions (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 28-34), design characteristics (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 6-9), component loading (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 28-34), and component usage (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 28-34); identifying significant random variables of said at least one failure mechanism (see Gollomp, column 3 lines 61-66); identifying statistical parameters of said significant random variables (see Gollomp, column 3 line 66 – column 4 line 1); and formulating a strategy for probabilistic analysis (see Gollomp, column 4 lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Gollomp because identifying the component failure and performing probabilistic analysis would have allowed the skilled artisan to determine performance degradation (see Gollomp, column 4 lines 1-4).

Referring to claims 24, 47 and 54, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that at least one said failure mechanism is described by an equation and said equation is divided into a capacity section and a demand section.

Gollomp teaches that at least one said failure mechanism is described by an equation and said equation is divided into a capacity section and a demand section (see Gollomp, column 6 lines 50-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Gollomp because dividing the equation into a capacity section and demand section would have allowed the skilled artisan to generate self-improving diagnostics (see Gollomp, column 6 lines 67-68).

Referring to claims 45 and 52, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said probabilistic model comprising at least one failure mechanism of a component of said system.

Gollomp teaches that said probabilistic model comprising at least one failure mechanism of a component of said system (see Gollomp, column 5 lines 3-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Gollomp because having a model with a system component failure would have allowed the skilled artisan to generate an improved behavior model (see Gollomp, column 62-67).

6. Claims 10, 21-23, 36, 41-43, 46, 53, 58 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) (hereinafter Quist) in view of Eastman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,597) (hereinafter Eastman).

Referring to claims 10, 36 and 58, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except for predicting failure in a material's microstructure.

Eastman teaches predicting failure in a material's microstructure (see Eastman, column 5 lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Eastman because monitoring a failure in the microstructure allows the skilled artisan to determine an acceptable failure rate so that the system can maintain or increase its level of reliability (see Eastman, column 2 lines 44-50).

Referring to claims 21, 41 and 63, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said probabilistic model utilizes simulation techniques.

Eastman teaches that said probabilistic model utilizes simulation techniques (see Eastman, column 5 lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Quist to include the teachings of Eastman, because a simulation would have allowed the skilled artisan to include preventive actions while handling multiple failure modes (see Eastman, column 6 lines 47-50).

Referring to claims 22, 42 and 64, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said simulation techniques are direct methods selected from a group including: Monte Carlo methods and importance sampling methods.

Eastman teaches that said simulation techniques are direct Monte Carlo methods (see Eastman, column 5 lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Quist to include the teachings of Eastman, because a simulation using the Monte Carlo method would have allowed the skilled artisan to include preventive actions while handling multiple failure modes (see Eastman, column 6 lines 47-50).

Referring to claims 23, 43 and 65, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said simulation techniques are response surface methods selected from a group including: Monte Carlo methods and importance sampling methods.

Eastman teaches that said simulation techniques are response surface Monte Carlo methods (see Eastman, column 5 lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Quist to include the teachings of Eastman, because a simulation using the Monte Carlo method would have allowed the skilled artisan to include preventive actions while handling multiple failure modes (see Eastman, column 6 lines 47-50).

Referring to claims 46 and 53, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said at least one failure mechanism relates to a material microstructure.

Eastman teaches that said at least one failure mechanism relates to a material microstructure (see Eastman, column 5 lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Eastman because monitoring a failure in the microstructure allows the skilled artisan to determine an acceptable failure rate so that the system can maintain or increase its level of reliability (see Eastman, column 2 lines 44-50).

7. Claims 11, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) (hereinafter Quist) in view of Bajpai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,857) (hereinafter Bajpai).

Referring to claims 11, 37 and 59, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said data comprises referenced data, sensed data, and inferred data and wherein said method further comprises relating said reference data to a first set of variables, relating said sensed data to a second set of variables, and inferring a third set of variables from said sensed data.

Bajpai teaches that said data comprises referenced data (see Bajpai, column 1 lines 62-65), sensed data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 6-7), and inferred data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 18-21) and wherein said method further comprises relating said reference data to a first set of variables, relating said sensed data to a second set of variables, and inferring a third set of variables from said sensed data (see Bajpai, column 1 lines 59-61).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Quist to include the teachings of Bajpai because multiple sets of data would have allowed the skilled artisan to diagnose multiple problems on a given machine (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 50-59).

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) (hereinafter Quist) in view of Gollomp (U.S. Patent No. 4,766,595) and further in view of Bajpai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,857) (hereinafter Bajpai).

Referring to claim 16, Quist and Gollomp teach all the features of the claimed invention except that said data comprises referenced data, sensed data, and inferred data and wherein said developing step further comprises determining which of said significant random variables are related to said referenced data, which of said significant random variables are related to said sensed data, and which of said significant random variables are inferred from said sensed data.

Bajpai teaches that said data comprises referenced data (see Bajpai, column 1 lines 62-65), sensed data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 6-7), and inferred data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 18-21) and wherein said developing step further comprises determining which of said significant random variables are related to said referenced data (see Bajpai, column 1 line 62 – column 2 line 5), which of said significant random variables are related to said sensed data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 6-17), and which

of said significant random variables are inferred from said sensed data (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 18-40).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Quist to include the teachings of Bajpai because multiple sets of data would have allowed the skilled artisan to diagnose multiple problems on a given machine (see Bajpai, column 2 lines 50-59).

9. Claims 18-20, 38-40 and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) (hereinafter Quist) in view of Tyron et al. ("A Reliability-Based Model to Predict Scatter in Fatigue Crack Nucleation Life") (hereinafter Tyron).

Referring to claims 18, 38 and 60, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said probabilistic model utilizes fast probability methods.

Tyron teaches that said probabilistic model utilizes fast probability methods (see Tyron, page 262-263, "Fatigue Reliability Model").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Tyron, because using probability methods would have allowed the skilled artisan to reduce time and cost associated with a purely empirical characterization program (see Tyron, page 258 lines 1-2, "Introduction").

Referring to claims 19, 39 and 61, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said fast probability methods are selected from a group including direct: First Order Reliability Methods, Second Order Reliability Methods, Advanced Mean Value methods, and Mean Value methods.

Tyron teaches that said fast probability methods are direct: First Order Reliability Methods or Advanced Mean Value methods (see Tyron, page 262-263, "Fatigue Reliability Model").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Tyron, because using probability methods would have allowed the skilled artisan to reduce time and cost associated with a purely empirical characterization program (see Tyron, page 258 lines 1-2, "Introduction").

Referring to claims 20, 40 and 62, Quist teaches all the features of the claimed invention except that said fast probability methods are selected from a group including response surface: First Order Reliability Methods, Second Order Reliability Methods, Advanced Mean Value methods, and Mean Value methods.

Tyron teaches that said fast probability methods are response surface: First Order Reliability Methods or Advanced Mean Value methods (see Tyron, page 262-263, "Fatigue Reliability Model").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Quist to include the teachings of Tyron, because using

probability methods would have allowed the skilled artisan to reduce time and cost associated with a purely empirical characterization program (see Tyron, page 258 lines 1-2, "Introduction").

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(a) Patel et al. teach a process and system for developing predictive diagnostics algorithms in a machine.

(b) Kaufer et al. teach time management and test completion and prediction software.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Kate B Baran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4474. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (703) 308-1677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,712
Art Unit: 2857

Page 17

MKB


MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800